UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,435	04/25/2001	Brian William Hughes	10004546-1	7471

22879　　7590　　09/13/2005		EXAMINER
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY		TORRES, JOSEPH D

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION	
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/842,435	HUGHES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph D. Torres	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 August 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>11-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>11-17 and 21-29</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>18-21</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 April 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6)☐ Other: _____ .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Action Summary Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050824

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   Newly submitted claims 21-29 are directed to an invention that is independent or

distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claim 21 recites,

"successively scanning each of a plurality of subsets of said memory segment, wherein

each said subset comprises at least two linear arrays of elements", which is properly

classified in 714/746. Claims 21-29 are directed to a method for scan testing subsets of

a memory segment different from the system of Group I which is directed to a system

for tracking and generating counts of identified faults in a memory (properly classified in

714/723) and the method of Group II which is a method for preserving an operation of a

memory segment by comparing a determined number of identified faults of evaluated

elements to a fault threshold value and re-mapping said memory segment in response

to a declared failure condition (properly classified in 714/711). Note: claim 21 is

directed to scan testing of subsets of said memory segment comprising two linear

arrays of elements whereas claim 18 is directed to evaluating after scan testing.

Inventions claims 21-29 and Group I are related as process and apparatus for its

practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as

claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the

apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process.

(MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process of claims 21-29 can be practiced by a

scan testing device. In this case, the system of Group I can be used in a method for

logging faults.

Inventions Group II and Claims 21-29 are related as subcombinations disclosed as

usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each

other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group II

has separate utility such as for use in a comparison test for comparing a determined

number of identified faults of evaluated elements to a fault threshold value. In the

instant case, invention Claims 21-29 has separate utility such as for scan testing

subsets of a memory segment. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented

invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for

prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 21-29 are withdrawn from consideration

as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP §

821.03.

2.   Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

   I.   Claims 11-17, drawn to A system for maintaining an operation of a

          memory segment comprising a means for evaluating elements of a

          plurality of subsets of said memory segment in row-fast order wherein

          each said subset is at least two linear arrays of said elements and a

means for generating a count of identified faulty ones of evaluated

elements found for each subset of said memory segment wherein said

generating means is operative to act successively through said plurality of

subsets, classified in class 714, subclass 723.

II.   Claims 18-20, drawn to A method for preserving an operation of a memory

segment comprising the steps of comparing a determined number of

identified faulty ones of evaluated elements to a fault threshold value and

physically re-mapping said memory segment in response to said declared

failure condition, classified in class 714, subclass 711.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group II and Group I are related as process and apparatus for its practice.

The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can

be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus

as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP §

806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus, Group I, can be used strictly for self-testing

comprising a means for evaluating elements of a plurality of subsets of said memory

segment in row-fast order wherein each said subset is at least two linear arrays of said

elements and a means for generating a count of identified faulty ones of evaluated

elements found for each subset of said memory segment wherein said generating

means is operative to act successively through said plurality of subsets and the

process, Group II, can be used in a self repair system comprising a means for

evaluating elements of a plurality of subsets of said memory segment in row-fast order

wherein each said subset is at least two linear arrays of said elements and a means for

generating a count of identified faulty ones of evaluated elements found for each subset

of said memory segment wherein said generating means is operative to act

successively through said plurality of subsets.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for

examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search

required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as

indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search

required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as

indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter,

restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Michael Papalas on 28 September 2004 a

provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II,

claims 18-29. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this

Office action. Claims 11-17 and 21-29 are withdrawn from further consideration by the

examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

This application contains claims 11-17 and 21-29 drawn to nonelected inventions. A

complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or

other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention,

the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of

the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in

the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request

under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Drawings

3.   In view of corrections to the drawings in the amendment filed 30 August 2004, all

objections to the drawings are withdrawn.

Specification

4.   In view of corrections to the specification in the amendment filed 30 August 2004,

all objections to the specification are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   In view of corrections to claims 18-20 in the amendment filed 30 August 2004, all

35 USC § 112 rejections to claims 18-20 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6.   Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Eaton; Steven G. et al. (US 4939694 A, hereafter referred to as Eaton) in view of

Harns; Timothy (US 4460997 A).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 18.

Eaton teaches evaluating elements of a memory segment (col. 4, lines 41-47 in Eaton

teach that Figure 3 of Eaton is comprises of IC chips 3-1; Note: an IC chips 3-1 in

Figure 3 is a memory segment); identifying faulty ones of said evaluated elements (col.

7, lines 5-15 in Eaton teach that ECC Engine 3-3 of Figure 3 in Eaton is used to identify

hard and soft errors at a memory location or cell; Note: a memory location or cell is a

memory element and a means for determining a hard error is means for determining a

faulty memory cell since hard errors are errors due to defective memory elements);

determining a number of said identified faulty ones of said evaluated elements in each

of a plurality of subsets of said memory segment (col. 5, lines 61-68 in Eaton teach that

that each IC chip 3-1 in Figure 3 stores data records in subsets of the IC chip 3-1; col. 7,

lines 14-17 in Eaton teaches that the ECC engine 3-3 is used to determine the number

of defects in a record; Note: a record is substantially a subset of a IC chip memory

segment 3-1); comparing said determined number to a fault threshold value (col. 7, lines

17-21 in Eaton teaches that if the number of defects exceeds a criterion for acceptable

ECC engine 3-3 margin; Note: a criterion for acceptable ECC engine 3-3 margin is a

threshold); declaring a failure condition for said memory segment if said determined

number is greater than equal to said fault threshold value for any column of said

memory segment (col. 7, lines 17-21 in Eaton teaches that if the number of defects

exceeds, i.e., is greater than or equal to, a threshold for acceptable ECC engine 3-3

margin, then that group of defective memory cells is taken out of use, i.e., a failure for

said memory segment is declared); and physically re-mapping said memory segment in

response to said declared failure condition (col. 7, lines 21-24 in Eaton teaches that the

group of declared defective memory cells are taken out of use and replaced or

remapped to replacement memory cells 3-5c in Figure 3).

However Eaton does not explicitly teach the specific use of evaluating elements of said

memory segment in row-fast order.

Harns, in an analogous art, teaches evaluating elements of said memory segment in

row-fast order (col. 32, lines 12-15, Harns). Note: Eaton teaches testing and evaluating

memory elements of a memory system but does not teach the details of how data is

read out of memory during testing. Harns, on the other hand, teaches a commonly

know means for reading data out of memory. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made would have been highly motivated to combine Eaton with Harns

in order to provide a means for reading data out of memory in the Eaton patent.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Eaton with the teachings of Harns by including use of

evaluating elements of said memory segment in row-fast order. This modification would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made,

because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of evaluating

elements of said memory segment in row-fast order would have provided the means for

reading data out of memory (col. 32, lines 12-15, Harns).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 19.

The Examiner asserts that col. 5, lines 61-68 of Eaton teaches Reed-Solomon ECC

check bits are used to check integrity of data after stored evaluation data is read out of

an nxm memory cell array segment. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made would have known that error checking for data d with check-bits c

occurs by re-encoding data d to produce re-encoded expected check-bits c' whereby c'

is compared to c to determine if an error has occurred (Note: comparing c to c' is

equivalent to comparing stored d+c to expected data d+c', hence comparing c to c' is a

step for comparing read stored evaluation data to expected data).

7.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eaton;

Steven G. et al. (US 4939694 A, hereafter referred to as Eaton) and Harns; Timothy

(US 4460997 A).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 20.

Eaton and Harns substantially teaches the claimed invention described in claims 18 and

19 (as rejected above).

However Eaton and Harns do not explicitly teach the specific use of a failure counter.

The Examiner asserts that col. 7, lines 14-17 in Eaton teaches that the ECC engine 3-3

is used to determine the number of defects in a subset. One of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made would have known that a counter is a means for

determining a number of defects in a subset. Note: the count only has to be retained for

analysis of a record and afterwards must be reset to evaluate a new record in Eaton.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Eaton and Harns by including use of a

failure counter. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have recognized that use of a failure counter would have provided the opportunity to

implement the means for determining a number of defects in a subset taught in the

Eaton patent (col. 7, lines 14-17 in Eaton teaches that the ECC engine 3-3 is used to

determine the number of defects in a subset).

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Torres whose telephone number is (571)

272-3829. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph D. Torres, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2133